

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0015643		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	02/03/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	08/30/2011
<b>Decision Date:</b>	03/26/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	01/13/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	01/27/2015

### HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to an expert reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. He/she has been in active clinical practice for more than five years and is currently working at least 24 hours a week in active practice. The expert reviewer was selected based on his/her clinical experience, education, background, and expertise in the same or similar specialties that evaluate and/or treat the medical condition and disputed items/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:  
 State(s) of Licensure: New Jersey, Michigan, California  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular Medicine

### CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

The injured worker is a 49 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 8/30/11. On 1/27/15, the injured worker submitted an application for IMR for review of TENS unit purchase. The treating provider has reported the injured worker complained of low back and left ankle/foot pain. The diagnoses have included lumbar radiculopathy, low back pain, hip bursitis, foot pain and left foot/ankle pain. Treatment to date has included physical therapy, transforaminal epidural steroid injection at L4-L5, medication, urine drug screening, and a psychological evaluation. On 1/13/15 Utilization Review modified tens unit purchase to a 30 day home trial of a generic 2-lead TENS unit. The MTUS, ACOEM, ODG Guidelines were cited.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

The Final Determination was based on decisions for the disputed items/services set forth below:

**TENS unit purchase:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG)

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Percutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation Page(s): 97.

**Decision rationale:** According to MUTUS guidelines, TENS is not recommended as primary treatment modality, but a one month based trial may be considered, if used as an adjunct to a functional restoration program. There is no evidence that a functional restoration program is planned for this patient. Furthermore, there is no clear information about a positive one month trial of TENS. There is no recent documentation of recent flare of his pain. The provider should document how TENS will improve the functional status and the patient's pain condition. Therefore, the prescription of TENS unit (purchase) is not medically necessary.